



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/004,617	10/27/2001	Bedros Hanounik		8183

7590 04/20/2004

Bedros Hanounik
Apt. 5308
19608 Pruneridge Ave
Cupertino, CA 95014

EXAMINER

MAI, TAN V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2124

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/004,617

Applicant(s)

HANOUNIK, BEDROS

Examiner

Tan V Mai

Art Unit

2124

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 February 2002.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 February 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2124

1. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because legal phraseology is used in this paragraph (i.e., "comprising" (line 3)). Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

2. Claims 1-10 rejected as failing to define the invention in the manner required by 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

The claim(s) are narrative in form and replete with indefinite and functional or operational language. The structure which goes to make up the device must be clearly and positively specified. The structure must be organized and correlated in such a manner as to present a complete operative device. The claim(s) must be in one sentence form only. Note the format of the claims in the patent(s) cited.

As per **independent claim 1**, the "m" and "n" should be defined. The terms "the matrix" (line 3), "the original matrix" (line 4) lacks antecedent bases. The period "." at the end is missing.

As per **dependent claim 2**, the claim language is indefinite because "dependent claim 2 recites different steps as shown in Fig. 6B. Dependent claim 2 should be rewritten in independent form.

As per **independent claim 3**, the "m" and "n" should be defined. The terms "the matrix" (line 3), "the original matrix" (line 4) lacks antecedent bases. The period "." at the end is missing.

As per **dependent claims 4-6**, the terms "**and**" in "claims 1, 2 and 3" are unacceptable multiple dependent claim wording. Also, see next paragraph. The terms "**may be**" are indefinite.

As per **dependent claim 7**, the term "**and**" in "claims 1 and 2" is unacceptable multiple dependent claim wording. Also, see next paragraph. The terms "**can be**" (line 1), "**can process**" (line 8) are indefinite. Although methods as described in Fig. 6A and 6B "can be used together back to back in a pipelined fashion" (claim 7, lines 1-2), claim 1 and claim 2 should be independent claims. Therefore, claim 7 can NOT dependent on BOTH claims [1 & 2].

As per **dependent claim 8**, the claim language is indefinite because claim 8 can NOT dependent on BOTH claims [1 & 2].

As per **independent claim 9**, the claim language is vague and indefinite. For instance, although the preamble of independent claim 9 claims "a set of registers ... have access to...functions", the claims fail to recite the necessary detail physical structures to perform the recited function(s) nor are there any recitation describing how such an "apparatus" (or a set of registers) is actually provided in the "apparatus". Sufficient detail apparatus or a set of registers must be recited to adequately describe and constitute the proposed "a set of registers ... have access to...functions". The period "." at the end is missing.

3. Claims 4-8 are objected under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The claims recite a method for manipulating data elements in transposing an array of m rows. The claimed invention comprises a plurality of mental steps whereby the claimed mental steps are non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the claimed method steps can be practiced mentally in conjunction with pen and paper.

However, in order for such a claimed computer-related process to be statutory, the method claims must include either a step that results: (1) in a physical transformation outside the computer, (2) in a limitation to a practical application, or (3) performed specific machine/element(s). Accordingly, claims 1-8 are clearly directed to a non-statutory process.

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Cited references are art of interest.

6. An examination of this application reveals that applicant is unfamiliar with patent prosecution procedure. While an inventor may prosecute the application, lack of skill in

Art Unit: 2124

this field usually acts as a liability in affording the maximum protection for the invention disclosed. Applicant is advised to secure the services of a registered patent attorney or agent to prosecute the application, since the value of a patent is largely dependent upon skilled preparation and prosecution. The Office cannot aid in selecting an attorney or agent.

Applicant is advised of the availability of the publication "Attorneys and Agents Registered to Practice Before the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office." This publication is for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tan V. Mai whose telephone number is (703) 305-9761. The examiner can normally be reached on Tue-Fri from 6:30am to 5:00pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki, can be reached on (703) 305-9662. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are:

After-final (703) 746-7238

Official (703) 746-7239

Non-Official/Draft (703) 746-7240.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.


TAN V. MAI
PRIMARY EXAMINER